



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

**COUNCIL
ADDENDUM 01.02.18**

4.30PM, THURSDAY, 1 FEBRUARY 2018

COUNCIL CHAMBER - HOVE TOWN HALL

ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page
65	WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.	1 - 2
	List of written questions received from members of the public (copy attached).	
66	DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.	3 - 4
	List of deputations received from members of the public (copy attached).	
67	PETITIONS FOR COUNCIL DEBATE	5 - 6
(i)	Open Brighton's Homeless Shelters 365 Days a Year: Amendment from the Green Group. Proposed by Councillor Gibson (copy attached).	
69	WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS.	7 - 18
	List of written questions received and the responses from councillors (copy attached).	
71	NEIGHBOURHOODS AND COMMUNITIES PORTFOLIO - PROPOSED FIELD OFFICER ROLE BUSINESS CASE	19 - 24
	Extract from the proceedings of the Neighbourhoods, Inclusion, Communities & Equalities Committee meeting held on the 22 nd January, 2018 (copy attached).	
72	AMENDMENTS TO NOTICES OF MOTION:	25 - 30
(1)	Mental Health Services. Proposed by Councillor Taylor (copy attached).	25-26
(4)	Resetting the Council's Relationship with the Trade Unions. Proposed by Councillor Hamilton (copy attached).	27-28
(7)	Bursaries for Nurses. Proposed by Councillor K. Norman (copy attached).	29-30

WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed for questions submitted by a member of the public who either lives or works in the area of the authority at each ordinary meeting of the Council.

Every question shall be put and answered without discussion, but the person to whom a question has been put may decline to answer. The person who asked the question may ask one relevant supplementary question, which shall be put and answered without discussion.

The following written questions have been received from members of the public.

1. QUESTION From: Siriol Hugh-Jones

Home Office uses immigration detention as a matter of routine, although detention causes serious harm to detainees and their families. Nowhere else in Europe locks people up without a time limit and we detain more people. One of the biggest detention centres, Brook House, is just half an hour from here, at Gatwick. Many of our fellow residents live with the fear of the dawn knock on the door. As a City of Sanctuary, will the Council endorse the These Walls Must Fall Campaign and demand an end to indefinite detention?

Councillor Daniel, Chair of the Neighbourhoods, Inclusion, Communities & Equalities Committee will reply.

2. QUESTION From: Christopher Hawtree

Would Councillor Robins please tell us what steps he has taken, or will take, to reinstate the Mobile Library?

Councillor Daniel, Chair of the Neighbourhoods, Inclusion, Communities & Equalities Committee will reply.

3. QUESTION From: Ross Harper

At the Environment, Sustainability and Transport committee meeting on 27/06/17 chair Gill Mitchell welcomed a draft of changes proposed to Francis Street, councillor Pete West suggested an update report be produced after 12 months but the Chair added that measures would be kept under review. Over 6 months have now passed and no changes have taken place, the street remains unsafe after failing a Stage 3 Road Safety Audit in September 2016, why are residents and other road users still awaiting the much needed changes?

Councillor Mitchell, Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee will reply.

4. QUESTION From: Maria Garrett Gotch

Performance indicators such as cost, nightly usage, and refusals have been requested as recently as the Housing Committee, 17.1.18, and not provided. The Centre is one very small part of services provided for those who are homeless and it is not yet known if it has been successful or not.

How can one welcome an initiative without looking at its achievements and why be self-congratulatory yet make no reference to other initiatives and the wider involvement of the community?

Councillor Moonan, Lead Member for Rough Sleepers will reply.

5. QUESTION From: Jim Deans on behalf of David Thomas

I submitted a question to the last Housing Committee. The Chair refused to hear my question on the grounds that it was more relevant to another committee.

Part 8.9 of the Constitution is the Protocol for Public Questions at Committees. There is no provision in it for any such refusal. A question may be rejected if it is on a matter for which the committee has *no* responsibility; there is nothing else on relevance.

Public Questions are to hold a committee to account. Will Members agree to examine the validity of the Chair's action to prevent them from hearing such questions?

Councillor Meadows, Chair of the Housing & New Homes Committee will reply.

DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed at each ordinary meeting of the Council for the hearing of deputations from members of the public. Each deputation may be heard for a maximum of five minutes following which one Member of the Council, nominated by the Mayor, may speak in response. It shall then be moved by the Mayor and voted on without discussion that the deputation be thanked for attending and its subject matter noted.

Notification of one Deputation has been received. The spokesperson is entitled to speak for 5 minutes.

(1) Deputation concerning Night Buses, Brighton and Hove**Spokesperson Ms. S. Ashton**

Supported by:
James Milonas
Clare Ede
Mark Taylor
Lou Cope
Martin Doswell
Jeanette Ashton
Sally Franks
Xeni Milonas

Ward affected: All

Councillor Mitchell, Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee will reply.

**(a) Deputation concerning Night Buses, Brighton and Hove
Spokesperson Ms. S. Ashton**

As of Sunday 14th January 2018, Brighton and Hove Bus Company reduced the provision of night buses in Brighton and Hove. Under the Bus Services Act, 2017 – *a need for enhanced partnerships and the provision of routes that look at demand rather than profit*, we ask the council to review the impact of this on the city, to raise it with the B&H Bus Co. and to impress upon them the view that this much needed service needs to be maintained and why. I speak on behalf of my supporters and the community who feel strongly about this as evidenced by the 10,000 plus petition currently circulating and still growing which is due to be presented to the Bus Co.

We believe there are a number of cross-cutting issues and therefore ask that these are considered by the relevant committees:

Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee to review:

- How key workers and shift workers will get home safely, affordably and in an environmentally-friendly way;
- How much longer taxi queues will impact on anti-social behaviour and therefore people's safety;
- The environmental impact due to increased taxi use;
- The safety of increased Uber use, which, as the Department of London Transport stated, is not a 'fit and proper' private car hire operator;
- The potential increase in unlicensed taxis and the increased risk of drink-driving.

Tourism, Development & Culture Committee to review:

- The negative impact on B&H's diverse nightlife; the effect on hospitality businesses' revenues and jobs;
- How our 11 million visitors (Festivals, Political Conference visitors and tourists) will be able to get home from events;
- How B&H will continue to attract much needed key workers/shift workers for the City's development without an appropriate 24-hour transport system; the impact on Brighton's student community.

Neighbourhoods, Inclusion Committees & Equalities Committee to review:

- How everybody (including women, the disabled, the young, the poor) will have equal access to B&H's City life and access to safe, affordable transport home;
- The impact on the disabled getting taxis with disabled facilities when taxis become oversubscribed.

We ask the council to liaise with their contacts in Sussex Police and the Business Crime Reduction Partnership about the potential negative impact on their roles concerning safety in the city if people are unable to travel home safely. We request that B&H City council and its partners upholds its responsibility to review, to liaise with B&H Bus Co. about, and to mitigate for the now inadequate night bus service in our 24-hour city. We believe this responsibility is in line with BHCC's Corporate Plan 2015-2019 and The Connected City; BHCC's service priorities: Economy, Jobs, Young People, Health & Wellbeing, Community Safety, Environmental Sustainability; and the Bus Services Act, 2017.

With 270,000 plus residents, 11 million visitors, 2 universities and a conference centre, Brighton and Hove needs clean, reliable, easily-accessible, inclusive transport 24 hours a day.

**OPEN BRIGHTON'S HOMELESS SHELTERS
365 DAYS A YEAR****PETITION FOR DEBATE****GREEN GROUP AMENDMENT**

To add additional recommendation 2.2 as shown in bold italics below:

2.2 That a report addressing the issues in this petition be submitted to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee which identifies resources that can be made available through the budget-setting process to prevent homelessness through:

- 365 day provision of accommodation for rough sleepers with appropriate support services to enable rough sleepers to make a permanent transition away from rough sleeping***
- Reversing the cut in the supply of supported accommodation for rough sleepers made in the summer of 2015***
- Expanding the supply of properties for use by Housing First and other move-on accommodation by buying and/or leasing suitable properties***
- Working more in partnership with community volunteers to support and expand community initiatives to prevent rough sleeping so that we can meet the Council's goal of 'No second night out'***

Proposed by: Cllr Gibson

Seconded by: Cllr Druitt

Recommendations if carried to read:

- 2.1 That the petition is noted and referred to the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee for consideration at its meeting on the 29th March 2018; and
- 2.2 That a report addressing the issues in this petition be submitted to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee which identifies resources that can be made available through the budget-setting process to prevent homelessness through:
- 365 day provision of accommodation for rough sleepers with appropriate support services to enable rough sleepers to make a permanent transition away from rough sleeping***

- Reversing the cut in the supply of supported accommodation for rough sleepers made in the summer of 2015
- Expanding the supply of properties for use by Housing First and other move-on accommodation by buying and/or leasing suitable properties
- Working more in partnership with community volunteers to support and expand community initiatives to prevent rough sleeping so that we can meet the Council's goal of 'No second night out'

WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

The following questions listed on pages 43 - 46 of the agenda have been received from Councillors and will be taken as read along with the written answers listed below.

(1) Councillor Littman

Further to my Oral Question to you at Full Council in November, and my Written Question to you at Full Council in December; I'm afraid I am still unclear.

In November you said you were: "pretty proud to have raised our recycling levels to the highest rate ever from the 24% under your administration to the 29.1% now" In December I pointed out that annual recycling rates were never as low as 24% under the Green administration, and that they were higher than 29.1% in 2008/9.

You responded by saying: "The figure of 24% relates to Q4 for the year 2014/15 (actual rate 24.14%)." And "The 29.1% rate is the highest ever compared to those achieved by the previous two political administrations on leaving office" In the first instance, you are comparing annual rates with quarterly rates, when it is clearly only valid to compare annual rates with annual rates. The only year in which the annual rate of recycling fell to 24.1% was your first year in charge of ETS; 2015/6.

In the second instance, you use 'ever' to mean, 'by comparison to two other instances', as opposed to its usual usage meaning. Do you acknowledge that in both cases your response could appear to be extremely misleading?

As noted, the rate of recycling which makes you feel 'pretty proud' is slightly lower than that achieved ten years ago. In the interim; the Green administration introduced initiatives capable of significantly boosting rates. Across the country, authorities which collect garden waste, have a second wheelie bin, and collect communal recycling, as we now do, thanks to the Green administration, are among the highest scorers. However, under the current administration, even given all these inherited advantages, Brighton and Hove still languishes near the bottom of the league. Can you explain why this is?

Further, on the question of garden waste recycling, how successful has it been? What percentage of the 29.1% you cited, is represented by the garden waste collection which our administration passed on to yours?

Reply from Councillor Mitchell – Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee

The previous response was correct and its context explained. The Labour Administration is working to increase the rate of recycling still further having inherited declining rates and declining customer satisfaction.

In July 2015, following the local elections in May that year, the Labour Administration presented a report to the Policy and Resources Committee proposing the introduction of a new garden waste service. This was followed in October 2015 by a report to the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee seeking approval of the business case and the implementation of the new service.

The garden waste collection service is proving popular and currently has 7,000 customers. Of the current 29.1% recycling rate, 1.1% is represented by the garden waste collection scheme.

(2) Councillor K. Norman

There are currently a number of public highways mostly in residential areas within Brighton and Hove where vehicle hire companies use those highways to park numerous vehicles, mostly cars and vans, that seriously affect the lives of many residents.

Can the Council provide information regarding the legality or otherwise of this process regarding the operation of a business and/or storage of vehicles in pursuit of a business on the public highway?

Reply from Councillor Mitchell – Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee

Commercial vehicles including vehicles belonging to hire companies are allowed to be parked on the public highway. As with any other vehicle, as long as they are legally parked, taxed and have the relevant insurance they can use the public highway. The council does not have any legal powers to prevent this type of vehicle parking. Both Trading Standards and the Police have looked into the legality of this practice and they too have found that no legislation is being breached.

When instances of this type of parking are reported the only course of action would be for the council to contact the company responsible, explain the residents' concerns and appeal to their better nature.

(3) Councillor Mac Cafferty

Further to the unanimously supported Green Group motion on Single Use Plastics at November's Full Council, can the Chair of the Policy Resources & Growth Committee please outline a full written timetable for the rollout of the actions the City Council intends to take including key decisions, committees and proposed budgets?

Reply from Councillor Morgan – Leader of the Council

Officers are currently consulting and investigating with all relevant teams and services in the council to develop a plan comprising short, medium and long term actions for reducing single use plastics (SUPs) and eliminating them where possible. This includes:

- An immediate piece of work with Procurement to review and identify in which contracts SUPs are most significant, and influence changes across our existing service provision as well as in future tendering processes;
- Working with the Outdoor Events team to identify the top 10 events to work with for running a plastic free trial;
- Support is also being provided by the Communications team for facilitating staff awareness and sharing of best practice.

There is also work underway through a partnership project under the Biosphere programme between BHCC Public Health, Sustainability Teams and Southern Water for targeting 20 large businesses/organisations/venues in the city to sign up to a water project for encouraging greater provision of tap water and elimination of plastic bottles.

The events work is a part of this Biosphere project. Officers are also closely liaising with the City's Plastic Free Pledge Campaign to get their support and expertise in the efforts the council are taking on this work. This is an opportunity to build upon and widen council support on litter reduction and plastic free initiatives happening across the city, nationally and internationally.

This work is helping to inform an initial report that will include a more detailed timeline of actions and any quick wins we can identify which will be brought to members at PRG in March 2018. This will then be followed up with a more comprehensive report at PRG in July 2018.

(4) Councillor Mac Cafferty

In the wake of the damning National Audit Office report into Private Finance Initiative (PFI) deals can the Labour administration lead on Finance please outline:

- each outstanding PFI deal;
- the monetary value of the original deal;
- how much payment is outstanding;
- the date when each was signed;
- how many years are left in each deal;
- what the City Council's auditors say about each of the deals in terms of value for money; and
- what work, if any, has been done to reduce the monetary value of each deal and achieve greater value for money for the council taxpayer."

Reply from Councillor Hamilton – Deputy Chair (Finance) of the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee

"The table below contains the key information requested. Please note the second column is an estimate for 2017/18 and the final column actual payments to date.

PFI Contract	PFI Credits received (annually) (£m)	Start Date	End Date	Total Unitary Payments from start to 2016/17 (£m)	2017/18 Unitary Payment (£m)	Years left on contract	Estimated Payments remaining post 2017/18 (£m)
Joint Waste PFI Scheme	(1.498)	01/04/2003	31/03/2033	124.579	12.441	15	£223.202m
Jubilee Library	(1.505)	30/11/2004	29/11/2029	27.429	2.519	12	£34.498m
Schools PFI	(2.390)	01/04/2003	31/03/2028	44.667	3.173	10	£30.255m
Total	(5.393)			196.675	18.133		£287.955m

PFI credits are given from central government to the authority.

Unitary Payments represent the total amount paid to the PFI contractors (£196.675m) up to 31 March 2017. The council has received PFI grants (credits) of approx. £80m toward the funding of these payments. The remaining balance is funded by Council Tax and Business Rates.

In terms of independent validation, the annual audit conclusion from EY is that the council does have robust arrangements in place for securing VfM.

With regard to the specific contracts there is currently a review of all three being undertaken to look at options for improving the value of the contracts. Due to the availability of PFI Credits (Grant) and the terms of PFI contracts, refinancing with council funding (which would necessarily involve borrowing) is not normally a viable option. However, other elements of the contracts, including insurance cover, income and activity assumptions, performance penalties, and the specification of services, can be considered and as such are periodically reviewed.

(5) Councillor Mac Cafferty

The Chair of the House of Commons Health Select Committee, Dr Sarah Wollaston MP, has written to the Secretary of Health and Social Care asking him to

“delay the introduction of the new contract for Accountable Care Organisations until after the Health Committee has taken the opportunity to hear evidence on the issues around the introduction of accountable care models to the NHS.”

Can the Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board please outline what, if any, discussions he has had with the Clinical Commissioning Group and other NHS partners in the city and region about Accountable Care Organisations in Brighton and Hove?

Reply from Councillor Yates – Chair of the Health & Wellbeing Board

“I can confirm that no discussion has taken place between myself, as Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board, the CCG or any other NHS organisation with respect to an Accountable Care Organisation in Brighton and Hove.”

(6) Councillor Mac Cafferty

Hove Lawns are in a terrible state following a summer where they were overused from events and effective remediation work wasn't carried out before the onset of winter. Can the Chair of the Tourism Development & Culture Committee outline when urgent remediation works will be carried out?

Reply from Councillor Robins – Chair of the Tourism, Development & Culture Committee

Hove Lawns are a well-used recreational area with a range of uses including events.

In order to consider the elected member concerns a site visit will be arranged including officers from the Cityparks and Events Teams.

This will enable the areas of concern for the elected member to be identified and consideration given to whether such areas have been caused by events together with any reinstatement works required.

(7) Councillor Mac Cafferty

Further to the collapse of Carillion and several London councils taking provided services in-house again, can the administration's finance lead outline any contracted and sub-contracted work that was performed by Carillion and what provision the City Council has made to ensure any work or services are not disrupted?

Reply from Councillor Hamilton – Deputy Chair (Finance) of the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee

The council has reviewed its exposure to Carillion. There are no direct contracts, and a single contract between Carillion and *your Energy Partnership*, of which Brighton & Hove is a member. However no payments have been made since 2013, and there is no further work planned.

As it stands, the council is not aware of services that will be disrupted, and market intelligence is monitored by the Procurement team on an ongoing basis to mitigate this risk.

(8) Councillor Mac Cafferty

Morgan Sindall took over a £160m contract on 5 January as the council's principal contractor from Westridge Construction, given that Morgan Sindall has a number of project and joint ventures with Carillion can the administration

identify if any of the contract involves Carillion and if an assessment has been done by the administration of any impact from the collapse of Carillion?”

Reply from Councillor Hamilton – Deputy Chair (Finance) of the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee

“The new Strategic Partnership is with Morgan Sindall only, and it was agreed in August 2017 with commencement in October. It concerns the supply of construction and major repair works for our commercial portfolio. The council only has a liability on a project by project basis. The length of the contract is five years plus 2 years extension. Carillion were not previously involved.

Identifying company exposures to the Carillion collapse and other similar events is not straight forwards, as there is no immediate legal requirement to do so. In addition, such information may be commercially harmful to companies making disclosures. However the Procurement team are proactively concerned in obtaining market intelligence where possible. The Orbis Partnership arrangement supports this aim, given its wider reach.

At this stage there are no concerns to report.”

(9) Councillor Mac Cafferty

“Laing O’Rourke was appointed as the lead contractor for the redevelopment of the hospital in December 2015. Given that Laing O’Rourke has filed its accounts late with Companies House raising concerns about its financial health what work is the administration doing to ensure the 3Ts is unaffected?”

Reply from Councillor Hamilton – Deputy Chair (Finance) of the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee

“The answer is similar to the previous one.

Identifying company exposures to the Carillion collapse and other similar events is not straight forwards, as there is no immediate legal requirement to do so. In addition, such information may be commercially harmful to companies making disclosures. However the Procurement team are proactively concerned in obtaining market intelligence where possible. The Orbis Partnership arrangement supports this aim, given its wider reach. In the case of Laing O’Rourke, the council’s work with health partners would heighten this intelligence.

At this stage there are no concerns to report.”

(10) Councillor Gibson

a) Hanover and Elm Grove CPZ

Please can you provide as of the 1st of January:

- 1) The total number of permits issued for zones V and zone S?
- 2) The numbers of annual and of 3 month permits issued for each of zones v and S?

- 3) The total permit income paid to the council from permit fees for zones V and S up until 1st of January?
- 4) The total capital expenditure incurred on markings, signage and other works needed for implementation of the CPZ in zones V and S?
- 5) The total capital expenditure from other budgets headings spent at the same time as the CPZ (ie cycle racks)

If community groups and local residents are able to fundraise the money needed for a covered cycle storage facility (at no cost to the council) and have identified a suitable location, can you confirm that, in the interests of supporting cycling with all the associated health benefits, the council will give the necessary permission to enable the facility to be installed? (subject to any consultation + planning that may be needed).

Reply from Councillor Mitchell – Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee

(a) Hanover and Elm Grove CPZ

The latest information we have available is as of the 1st December 2017:

- 1) The total number of permits issued for zones V and zone S?

Area V (Full scheme) – 2384 permits (2488 limit)

Area S (Light touch scheme) – 1791 permits issued (2288 limit)

- 2) The numbers of annual and of 3 month permits issued for each of zones V and S?

	Zone V	Zone S
Blue Badge	52	70
3 Month	337	0
6 Month	0	388
1 Year	1995	1333

- 3) The total permit income paid to the council from permit fees for zones V and S up until 1st of December?

Total = £317,087 (Includes business permit, resident permit income and visitor permits)

- 4) The total capital expenditure incurred on markings, signage and other works needed for implementation of the CPZ in zones V and S?

Total = £435,450

- 5) £26,370 from the Local Transport Plan's Capital Programme

- (b)** Whilst we actively pursue opportunities for cycle facilities within new Controlled Parking Schemes including on and off carriageway pedal cycle parking spaces, the Council would be willing to work with local residents on the potential for covered cycle parking within CPZ's.

(11) Councillor Gibson

- a) Numbers accommodated in emergency and temporary accommodation

For 2016/17, please can you provide the number of households that were housed by each provide by:

- i) Helgor Trading
 - ii) Baron Homes
- b) How much under the HRA borrowing cap was BHCC on 1st April 2016 and the 1st of April 2017?
- c) Financial modelling of new council homes

Please can you provide the figures for the estimated surplus/deficit over the 60 year financial modelling period (currently used-indicating for each scheme whether the most current assumptions have been made or those used previously) for:

- Aldwick Mews
- Brook Mead
- Darwell Court
- Flint Close
- Hobby Place
- Kite Place
- Pierre Close
- Preston Rd
- Robert Lodge (N)
- Robert Lodge (S)
- Lynchet Close
- Kensington St.

Reply from Councillor Meadows – Chair of the Housing & New Homes Committee

- a) i) Helgor Trading 322
ii) Baron Homes 293
- b) As at 1/4/2016 the HRA total borrowing was £112.825m which is £44.014m below the borrowing cap of £156.839m.
- As at 1/4/2017, the HRA total borrowing was £123.117m, £33.722m below the borrowing cap.
- c) These schemes were all considered and approved by the Housing & New Homes Committee taking into account the long term implications for the ring-fenced Housing Revenue Account including consideration of appropriate scheme costs and rent levels. A number of the schemes are now occupied by tenants with costs and rental streams being as anticipated.

Re-modelling the financial impact of new build schemes over 60 years is a significant piece of work and officers will therefore provide a written response to this question as soon as practicably possible.

(12) Councillor Deane

Yet more months have slipped by since Surrey Street residents were assured that a solution was in hand to their daily and nightly suffering from taxis ranking outside their homes. However, nothing seems to have happened and the deplorable situation remains the same. Could Cllr Mitchell please provide an update on where things currently stand, and things have developed since the last update?

Reply from Councillor Mitchell – Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee

As has been reported previously, the wider station infrastructure project by Govia Thameslink Railway (GTR) to help alleviate the problems associated with taxis waiting in Surrey Street have been delayed.

However, council officers now understand that GTR's plans have been advanced and the company may be in a position to share them. Officers are contacting GTR with the intention of setting up a meeting to hear about this progress, their plans and timescales to which you will be invited.

(13) Councillor Deane

Further to the report brought to Licensing Committee consistently stating 'no queuing', can the Chair of the Licensing Committee please provide an update on whether there has been any further monitoring of taxis in Surrey Street to coincide with busy periods such as the arrival of trains from London, and what action has been taken as a result? Can the Chair of Licensing Committee also confirm whether such monitoring can be carried out on a regular basis?

Reply from Councillor O'Quinn – Chair of the Licensing Committee

We acknowledge that Surrey St/Station is a difficult issue regarding traffic management and there are times when it is congested.

Taxi licensing and police officers have been monitoring Surrey St during their enforcement operations. Attached is a log (18.08-20.01.2018) of their findings and complaints received regarding Surrey St. In September 2017 we wrote to all Hackney Carriage Drivers warning drivers about illegal ranking and conduct and officers and police reported an improvement in the area.

Recently, the amount of enforcement activities have temporarily reduced due to two members of the taxi licensing team leaving but we are in the process of recruiting and hope to have a position filled in the next few weeks. As yet the officers have not targeted specific train arrivals but monitoring periods have been up to 30 minutes at a time so would have included times when trains arrived at Brighton station.

For information, our parking enforcement contractor (NFL) operator a 24hr answer machine service (tel. 0345 603 5469 option 2) and carry out enforcement work between 07.00Hrs and 00.00Hrs. A full team works from 07.00Hrs – 20.00Hrs and then a mobile patrol unit operators between 20.00Hrs – 00.00Hrs. They are contracted to attend within an hour of any call but if the complaint is about a city centre rank then CEOs (Civil Enforcement Officers) would be expected to attend well within that time.

We will continue to monitor the area as part of our enforcement work but the effectiveness of enforcement is short-term and limited to when officers can attend and powers available. It is acknowledged that a more long term solution is needed looking at the operation and location of the station “rank” and the road layout.

Surrey Street taxis monitoring 18.08.2017 to 20.01.18

Day	Date	Time	Note	Photo
Friday	18.08.2017	16.43	No Queuing	Yes
Saturday	06.09.2017	14.02	No Queuing	Yes
Saturday	09.09.2017	02.27	Taxis in bus stop after station closed. No Queuing in Surrey Street	Yes x 2
Saturday	09.09.2017	21.41	No Queuing	Yes
Wednesday	13.09.2017	20.45	No Queuing	No
Wednesday	13.09.2017	20.07	No Queuing	No
Wednesday	13.09.2017	22.34	No Queuing	No
Friday	15.09.2017	16.15	No Queuing	No
Friday	22.09.2017	16.15	Queueing behind bus	Yes
Friday	22.09.2017	22.41	4 x HC pullover traffic able to pass	No
Friday	22.09.2017	23.58	No Queuing	No
Saturday	23.09.2017	02.09	Taxis in bus stop after station closed. No Queuing in Surrey Street	Yes x 2
Saturday	23.09.2017	21.15	No Queuing	No
Saturday (police)	18.11.2017	21.30	Clear	No
Sunday (police)	19.11.2017	21.30	Clear	No

Location	Date	Time	Observation / Action
Saturday	13.01.2018	17.57hrs	4 HC waiting in Surrey Street. Asked to drive around area until able to enter station. Observed

			<p>area for 25 mins no further HC vehicles waited in area. Observed 2 Buses block road to traffic whilst no HC in Surrey Street.</p> <p>Mike Spoke to resident who had been in contact with Cllr. Dean and talked through the problems that the change to Surrey Street has caused by making it one way street etc. Resident was happy that we out and that we were monitoring the situation she is going to be in contact with councillor to raise suggestions</p>
--	--	--	---

Saturday	20.01.2018	13.55	Road Clear
	Monitoring	14.01	Queuing traffic caused by traffic lights
	13.55 to	14.03	Queuing traffic caused by traffic lights
	14.25	14.15	2 HC's advised to keep driving round until there is space in the station
		14.17	Road blocked by Police Van parking at top of road and bus at bus stop. Cleared 14.20. Police Van remained causing obstruction

Surrey Street Service Requests (Complaints)

Date	Subject	Investigating Team
30.10.2012	AQ Advice	Environmental Protection
26.06.2015	Noise from Taxis from 9pm to 3/4am Drivers talking to each other, radio playing	Environmental Protection
24.09.2015	Councillor complaint – Environmental issues regarding Taxis	Taxis Licensing
26.02.2016	Concerns regarding pollution caused by taxis	Environmental Protection
29.07.2016	Taxis and AQ monitoring for Cllrs.	Environmental Protection
09.08.2016	Taxis and pollution around station	Environmental Protection
20.10.2016	Councillor Complaint re 58 Surrey Street	Environmental Protection
14.03.2017	ETS committee 14.03.17 Surrey Street AQ	Environmental Protection

Council

1 February 2018

Agenda Item 71

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject: Neighbourhoods and Communities Portfolio – Proposed Field Officer Role Business Case - Extract from the proceedings of the Neighbourhoods, Inclusion, Communities & Equalities Committee meeting held on the 22 January 2018

Date of Meeting: 1 February 2018

Report of: Executive Lead for Strategy, Governance & Law

Contact Officer: Name: Penny Jennings Tel: 01273 291065
E-mail: penny.jennings@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Wards Affected: All

FOR GENERAL RELEASE***Action Required of Council:***

To receive the report referred from the Neighbourhoods, Inclusion, Communities & Equalities Committee meeting held on the 22nd January 2018 for information.

Recommendations:

That full Council notes the contents of the report.

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
NEIGHBOURHOODS, INCLUSION, COMMUNITIES & EQUALITIES
COMMITTEE

4.00pm 9 OCTOBER 2017

THE BRIDGE COMMUNITY CENTRE, LUCRAFT ROAD, BRIGHTON

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Daniel (Chair), A Norman (Opposition Spokesperson), West (Group Spokesperson); Bewick, Cattell, K Norman, Peltzer Dunn, Penn (for Moonan) and Miller (for Simson).

Invitees: Chief Superintendent Lisa Bell, Police Representative; Joanna Martindale; Hangleton & Knoll Project and Anusree Biswas Sassidharan, BME Police Engagement Group

Apologies: Councillor Knight.

PART ONE

- 56.1 The Committee considered the further report of the Executive Director, Neighbourhoods, Communities and Housing setting out the business case for a new Field Officer role. The report was introduced by the Environmental Health Manager, Environmental Protection.
- 56.2 It was noted that consideration of the recommendations contained in the “Proposed Field Officer Business Case” report put forward to the previous meeting of the Committee on 27 November had been deferred.
- 56.3 The Environmental Health Manager, Environmental Protection, explained that the proposed implementation dates and timetables detailed in the report and recommendations 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6 had been updated to address concerns raised by members at the November meeting. The Risk Log in Appendix 1 had also been amended accordingly. Concerns raised had included resourcing of the programme, loss of the Noise Patrol service, and the scale and management of the programme. The proposed controls to address these concerns were referred to in risks 1 – 4 of the Risk Log. Concerns about delivery and implementation of an effective mobile platform the ICT and Digital First had also been addressed and the timetable had also been updated to reflect the progress being made with implementation of the tablet and trialling of the associated UNIFORM applications, this was also detailed in Appendix 1.

- 56.4 The Environmental Health Manager explained that the Business Case for the Field Officer role had been developed in collaboration with staff and service heads, external partners, unions and also information collated from recent community workshops. Similar work being carried out by other local authorities had also been considered, with further work undertaken since the previous meeting of the Committee regarding models used elsewhere. The Business Case had been presented to and received full support of the Corporate Modernisation Delivery Board and in addition detailed presentations had been given to each of the political groups. In answer to questions the Environmental Health Manager explained that this role would complement existing specialist officers and would provide a more streamlined service without duplication and would require approval of the Policy, Resources and Growth Committee to the necessary amendments to the Council's existing "Scheme of Delegations to Officers" before the Field Officers started in post.
- 56.5 Councillor West stated that he did not consider that the report had addressed any of the earlier issues raised to his satisfaction. He explained that he still had major concerns in terms of cost, suitability, workload and managing expectations. Councillor West stated that the report currently put forward for consideration differed very little from that submitted previously in his view and his preference was still that a pilot scheme should take place first; the risks had been "dumbed down", the concerns expressed by the unions were well made in his opinion.
- 56.6 The Executive Director, Neighbourhoods, Communities and Housing, stated that aims and objectives of the proposed Field Officer role were consistent with those of the Communities and Neighbourhoods Portfolio, namely of putting communities at the heart of service delivery, whilst at the same time supporting delivery of savings and making the most effective use of resources. The rationale for operating a "city wide" approach to service delivery was to avoid dividing the city into different models of service delivery with the attendant risk of creating hotspots and varying degrees of enforcement and would provide a single point of contact. The 4 different rota options set out in Appendix 1 had different hours of delivery and different costings but had been budgeted for and had been updated following consideration of the previous report and had also been addressed both in considering the financial implications and within Appendix 1.
- 56.7 Councillor Peltzer Dunn stated that whilst he had some concerns in relation to the practicalities of delivering some of the interface with the noise patrol team, he considered that it was also important to take a global view and on that basis he was happy to support the report recommendations. He did consider however that it was important for the Committee to be advised regarding progress requesting that a further update report be provided to the Committee in 12 months. Councillor Miller concurred and it was confirmed that this would be done.

- 58.8 Councillor Miller stated that he welcomed this initiative which provided the opportunity to deliver improvements for residents. He considered that in the longer term it was important to ensure that there was no conflict or duplication and that expectations were managed. The Executive Director, Neighbourhoods, Communities and Housing explained that these posts would compliment existing roles and would provide greater flexibility by being available at weekends. They would not however replace the wider remit of specialist officers e.g., housing officers.
- 58.9 Councillor Cattell stated that she had supported these proposals when the earlier report had been considered by the Committee at its meeting in November 2017. The further information provided in the report reinforced that and she was happy to support the recommendations.
- 58.10 Councillor Penn confirmed that she also supported the report recommendations which she considered would provide innovative, robust and flexible solutions at local level. The collaboration with other partners was also welcomed. It was important to ensure that measures were put into place to ensure officer safety
- 58.11 Councillor A Norman confirmed that the clarification provided in respect of the various issues raised at the previous meeting was welcomed and she was satisfied by the reassurance it provided. Her only remaining concerns were in respect of ensuring that staff who were rendered potentially vulnerable in consequence of lone working were properly protected. It was confirmed that a range of measures including call – in arrangements, buddying etc., would be put in place to ensure staff safety.
- 58.12 Councillor Bewick also welcomed the report but was also in agreement to ensure that realistic expectations were set.
- 58.13 Councillor K Norman also welcomed the report citing the changes in process which were anticipated in relation to invoking Public Space Protection Orders. The incidence of certain types of offence in the absence of a flexible and pro-active response was recognised.
- 56.14 A vote was taken and on a vote of 8 to 1 the recommendations in the report were agreed.
- 56.15 Councillor West requested that the report be referred to Council for information in view of its far reaching in his view, implications. A further vote was taken on whether the Committee wished to refer the report to full Council which was lost on a vote of 8 to 1. Councillor West was advised that it would be possible for the Green Group to write to the Chief Executive formally requesting that the report be referred.

56.16 RESOLVED:

- (1)** That the Committee agrees to the creation of a Field Officer Team as set out at Option 1 of the Business Case on Page 12 of Appendix 1 to the report;
- (2)** Agrees the revised proposed of functions and services based on the outcome of workshops with frontline staff and managers as set out at paragraphs 3.43 to 3.50 of the report;
- (3)** Agrees the funding and resources required for the set-up of the Field Officer support role as set out at paragraphs 3.29 to 3.42 of the report and pages 16 to 20 of Appendix 1 to the report;
- (4)** Notes the timetable; for implementation and associated communication and engagement work with key stakeholders as set out in section 5 of the report (paragraphs 5.1 to 5.12), and pages 28 and 29 and pages 38 to 39 of Appendix 1;
- (5)** Notes the updated risks and mitigation actions set out in pages 21 to 26 of Appendix 1;
- (6)** Notes the updated Digital First timetable for delivery as set out on pages 27 to 28 of Appendix 1; and
- (7)** Notes that the detailed amendments to the Scheme of Delegations to Officers referred to at paragraphs 3.16 to 3.19 of the report will be reported to the Policy Resources and Growth Committee for approval before the Field Officers started to exercise Council functions.

NOTICE OF MOTION

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

CONSERVATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT

That the motion be amended to delete the words as struck through and insert those shown in ***bold italic***.

This council requests the Chief Executive to write to ***the respective Leaders of all Parliamentary Political Parties requesting that a working group is established to challenge Mental Health service delivery through the NHS and work together to improve the situation that would include:-*** ~~the Secretary of State for Health calling on them to:~~

- ***Ensure***ing services are fully funded and fit for purpose, so that parity of esteem can be achieved, and that people can be treated locally wherever possible so that they can be supported by their families, carers and voluntary services
- ***End***ing the fragmentation of services and ensure there are clear pathways to treatment and counselling regardless of level of need
- ***Ensure***ing that everyone experiencing a mental health crisis is given prompt and appropriate treatment
- ***Guarantee***ing everyone detained under S136 of the Mental Health Act is taken to a ***an appropriate and best*** place ***for the individual.*** ~~of safety in the county in which they reside.~~

That this Council also recognises that Government funding on mental health services for the CCGs has increased by £573 million and that the Government pilot scheme grant in 2015 to Brighton and Hove City Council to improve mental health in children in schools has had positive results in diverting referrals away from CAHMS.

Proposed by: Cllr Taylor

Seconded by: Cllr Brown

Motion if carried to read:

This council requests the Chief Executive to write to the respective Leaders of all Parliamentary Political Parties requesting that a working group is established to challenge Mental Health service delivery through the NHS and work together to improve the situation that would include:-

- Ensuring services are fully funded and fit for purpose, so that parity of esteem can be achieved, and that people can be treated locally wherever possible so that they can be supported by their families, carers and voluntary services.
- Ending the fragmentation of services and ensure there are clear pathways to treatment and counselling regardless of level of need.
- Ensuring that everyone experiencing a mental health crisis is given prompt and appropriate treatment.
- Guaranteeing everyone detained under S136 of the Mental Health Act is taken to an appropriate and best place for the individual.

That this Council also recognises that Government funding on mental health services for the CCGs has increased by £573 million and that the Government pilot scheme grant in 2015 to Brighton and Hove City Council to improve mental health in children in schools has had positive results in diverting referrals away from CAHMS.

Council	Agenda Item 72 (4)
1 February 2018	Brighton & Hove City Council

NOTICE OF MOTION

**RESETTING THE COUNCIL'S RELATIONSHIP WITH THE TRADE UNIONS
LABOUR AND COOPERATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT**

This Council calls on the Chief Executive to:

- 1 ***Continue to demonstrate through current work on the People Plan acknowledge that the most valuable resource of this Council is its workforce;***
- 2 ***Note the extremely negative impact of austerity on all public sector workers including council staff, with knock-on impact to many people including workplace representatives, and which should be addressed by sufficient funding for public services;***
- 23 Note that the LGA Peer Review indicated that the Council's relationship with the Trades Unions is dysfunctional;
- 34 Note that the LGA Peer Review called for external facilitation to be brought in to enable a 're-set' to take place;
- 45 Note the concern of the trades unions expressed during the recent consultation process for The Royal Pavilion and Museums Trust Arrangements;
- 6 ***Note positive steps taken towards an improved relationship through the written Trades Union Recognition Agreement;***
- ~~5. Set up a cross-party working group to oversee external facilitation that would 're-set' the relationship between the Council and The Trade Unions to take place.~~
- 7 ***In agreement with the trade unions, confirm other appropriate steps that might be explored with the aim of having the best possible working relationship despite the impact of austerity.***

Proposed by: Cllr Les Hamilton

Seconded by: Cllr Gill Mitchell

Motion if carried to read:

- This Council calls on the Chief Executive to:
- 1 Continue to demonstrate through current work on the People Plan that the most valuable resource of this Council is its workforce;
 - 2 Note the extremely negative impact of austerity on all public sector workers including council staff, with knock-on impact to many people including workplace representatives, and which should be addressed by sufficient funding for public

services;

- 3 Note that the LGA Peer Review indicated that the Council's relationship with the Trades Unions is dysfunctional;
- 4 Note that the LGA Peer Review called for external facilitation to be brought in to enable a 're-set' to take place;
- 5 Note the concern of the trades unions expressed during the recent consultation process for The Royal Pavilion and Museums Trust Arrangements;
- 6 Note positive steps taken towards an improved relationship through the written Trades Union Recognition Agreement;
- 7 In agreement with the trade unions, confirm other appropriate steps that might be explored with the aim of having the best possible working relationship despite the impact of austerity.

NOTICE OF MOTION**BURSARIES FOR NURSES****CONSERVATIVE AMENDMENT**

That the motion be amended to delete the words struck through and insert those shown in ***bold italic***.

This Council notes the current shortage of NHS nurses, which has reached critical levels and as such may well have an impact on the quality of services Brighton and Hove residents will receive. This Council further notes grave concerns expressed by the Royal College of Nurses about challenges in recruiting new nurses and retaining existing levels both locally and nationally.

This Council therefore asks the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State requesting that bursaries for nursing degree courses be reinstated with immediate effect to help to avoid a worsening of this situation from 2020 onwards

This Council also asks that the Chairs of Health and Wellbeing Board and HOSC request a report to be brought to these respective committees ~~every 6 months~~ ***when necessary and as determined by the respective Chairs***, detailing the progress on work done around improving retention of nurses.

Proposed by: Cllr K Norman

Seconded by: Cllr Simson

Motion if carried to read:

This Council notes the current shortage of NHS nurses, which has reached critical levels and as such may well have an impact on the quality of services Brighton and Hove residents will receive. This Council further notes grave concerns expressed by the Royal College of Nurses about challenges in recruiting new nurses and retaining existing levels both locally and nationally.

This Council therefore asks the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State requesting that bursaries for nursing degree courses be reinstated with immediate effect to help to avoid a worsening of this situation from 2020 onwards

This Council also asks that the Chairs of Health and Wellbeing Board and HOSC request a report to be brought to these respective committees when necessary and as determined by the respective Chairs, detailing the progress on work done around improving retention of nurses.

